

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending in the Application, and claim 13 has been withdrawn from consideration. Claim 1 has been amended and claims 7 and 10 have been canceled. Support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found at least in canceled claims 7 and 12. No new matter has been added by the amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims 1-12 are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 7 and 10-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by (U.S. Patent No. 6,392,719, hereinafter “ ‘719 patent”). The Examiner states that the ‘719 patent discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims, primarily in FIGS. 1 and 3-5, and column 2 and column 4.

Applicants respectfully point out that this reference appears to be a new reference of record as it is not listed on any form PTO892 or any Information Disclosure Statement (PTO/SB/08 **) of record. Furthermore, it is noted that the name of the inventor(s) is not provided to ensure accuracy of the intended cited reference. Pursuant to MPEP § 1302.12 “[a]ll references which have been cited by the examiner during the prosecution, including those appearing in Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences decisions or listed in the reissue oath, must be listed on either a form PTO-892 or on an Information Disclosure Statement (PTO/SB/08 **) and initialed. All such reference citations will be printed in the patent.”

Based on the U.S. Patent No. 6,392,719 reported on page 2 of the Detailed Action, Applicants have responded to the outstanding Office action assuming that the Examiner’s intent to reject claims 1-3, 7 and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) using Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,392,719, hereinafter “Kim”). However, Applicants seek clarification and confirmation of this new reference by citation in a corrected or new form PTO-892 which would list the issue date and inventor(s) name associated with the patent number.

Furthermore, it is respectfully noted that the recitation of claim 1 on page 2 of the Detailed Action before the present amendment thereto reflected herein is not accurate as Kim is applied thereto. In particular, the Examiner refers to elements not cited in claim 1 (i.e., the at least one inspection line includes a test pad for receiving an externally applied test signal, and the test pad is formed at a position where an external device is attached to the liquid crystal panel).

Notwithstanding the above, it is respectfully submitted that a feature of the present application includes the position of pads for a VI test. In Kim, the shorting bar (6, 7, 8) and pads are cut out from the substrate by the scribing step after the VI test. However, in the present application, the shoring bar and pads remain on the substrate after the VI test. In the present application, this is possible because of the position of the pads.

In addition, Kim does not disclose, teach or suggest that the inspection line and the second display signal lines are electrically separated, as recited in amended claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 2- 12, define over Kim.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4-6 and 8-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Kim in view of Kawasaki (U.S. Patent No. 6,424,400, hereinafter "Kawasaki"). The Examiner states that Kim discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims except, *a plurality of straight connecting lines interconnecting chip drivers wherein the test pad is closer to an edge of the liquid crystal panel than to the connecting liens and a plurality of flexible printed circuit films attached to the liquid crystal panel, wherein the external devices are the flexible printed circuit films*, which the Examiner further states is disclosed primarily in FIG. 8 and column 2 of Kawasaki.

In FIG. 8 of Kawasaki relied upon by the Examiner, the pads are located between the driver ICs (3), thus Kawasaki has the problem of interference between the signal lines and the inspection line and pads. However, the present application has the purpose of not interfering between the signal lines and the inspection line and pads. Kawasaki does not

teach or suggest the test pad is disposed between the driver and an edge of the TFT array panel, as in amended independent claim 1, from which claims 4-6, 8 and 9 depend.

Moreover, regarding the rejection of claim 8, the Examiner states that "the test pad is closer to an edge of the liquid crystal panel than to the connecting lines" on page 3 of the Detailed Action is disclosed in Kawasaki. However, referring to Fig. 8 of Kawasaki, the comments of the Examiner are not correct, as the pads are located between the driver ICs (3), as discussed above.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claims 4-6, 8 and 9 under § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that a corrected or new form PTO-892 be issued, pursuant to MPEP § 710.06, since every correction MUST be reflected on a corrected or new PTO-892, pursuant to MPEP § 707.05(g).

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /James J. Merrick/
James J. Merrick
Registration No. 43,801
Confirmation No. 7173
Cantor Colburn LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
PTO Customer No. 23413
Telephone: (860) 286-2929
Facsimile: (860) 286-0115

Date: April 23, 2007